

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

Charles K. Verhoeven (Bar No. 170151)

2 charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com

David A. Perlson (Bar No. 209502)

3 davidperlson@quinnemanuel.com

Melissa Baily (Bar No. 237649)

4 melissabaily@quinnemanuel.com

John Neukom (Bar No. 275887)

5 johnneukom@quinnemanuel.com

Jordan Jaffe (Bar No. 254886)

6 jordanjaffe@quinnemanuel.com

50 California Street, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor

7 San Francisco, California 94111-4788

Telephone: (415) 875-6600

8 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

9 Attorneys for WAYMO LLC

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

12 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

13 WAYMO LLC,

14 Plaintiff,

15 vs.

16 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;  
17 OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING  
LLC,

18 Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:17-cv-00939

**PLAINTIFF WAYMO LLC'S MOTION IN  
LIMINE 14**

Date: September 27, 2017

Time: 8:00 a.m.

Ctrm: 8, 19th Floor

Judge: Honorable William H. Alsup

Trial Date: October 10, 2017

1 The Court should preclude Defendants from arguing that Anthony Levandowski has not  
 2 “cooperated” with their investigation and defense efforts in this case. Mr. Levandowski clearly  
 3 has cooperated with Defendants in this case, although only when it serves him to do so.  
 4 Nevertheless, both Defendants and Mr. Levandowski have precluded Waymo from taking  
 5 discovery into the degree of cooperation under the guise of privilege. Once again, however,  
 6 Defendants should not be allowed to use privilege as a sword and a shield. Such evidence should  
 7 be excluded.

### 8 **BACKGROUND**

9 Throughout this case, Uber has indicated that it plans to tell the jury that Mr. Levandowski  
 10 has refused to cooperate with their investigation, presumably as an excuse for not completing it.  
 11 (*See, e.g.*, Dkt. 821 (“After learning Levandowski’s explanations for Waymo’s allegations, Uber  
 12 has repeatedly urged him to testify, cooperate, and clear Uber’s name.”); Dkt. 1088-1 at 78:15-19  
 13 (Travis Kalanick testifying, “My feeling is, he should -- he should testify. That -- that he should  
 14 say what happened, why, how, and he should cooperate with the company and the Court in  
 15 getting to the facts of the matter. And I felt pretty passionately about it.”). During Mr.  
 16 Levandowski’s August 22 deposition, counsel for Uber asked Mr. Levandowski questions  
 17 purporting to demonstrate his refusal to cooperate. (*E.g.*, Ex. 1 at 271:13-272:18 (“MS. DUNN:  
 18 Q. But you would not cooperate with Uber’s investigation in this case, right?” A: [invocation of  
 19 the Fifth Amendment].). But when Waymo asked questions to inquire about the purported non-  
 20 cooperation (*e.g.*, “Q Was -- what specifically did you tell Uber you would not do in relation to  
 21 Uber’s investigation in relation to this litigation?”; “what specifically did Uber’s lawyers tell you  
 22 to do in relation to Uber’s investigation, in relation to this litigation, that you refused to do?”),  
 23 Uber and Otto Trucking instructed Mr. Levandowski not to answer on grounds of attorney-client  
 24 privilege. (*Id.* at 296:11-299:10.) Mr. Levandowski has also asserted the attorney-client and  
 25 common interest privileges over communications with Uber attorneys regarding the pending  
 26 litigation. (Dkt. 1380.)

27 Moreover, Mr. Levandowski clearly *has* cooperated with Defendants in this case. For  
 28 example, during the August 22 deposition of Waymo LiDAR engineer Pierre-Yves Droz, counsel

1 for Otto Trucking introduced a set of earrings (derived from PCBs in an early version of GBr2)  
 2 that had never been produced in discovery. (Ex. 2 at 33:17-41:39:4.) Mr. Levandowski  
 3 purportedly gave these earrings as a farewell gift to Seval Oz (a former Waymo employee) when  
 4 she left Waymo. (*Id.*) When asked about how Otto Trucking had come into possession of these  
 5 earrings – let alone learned of their existence – counsel for Otto Trucking refused to answer on  
 6 grounds of attorney-client privilege and work product. (*Id.* at 88:8-90:3.) However, on the last  
 7 day of fact discovery, Mr. Levandowski produced a set of text messages revealing that *he* is the  
 8 one who collected the earrings from Ms. Oz, evidently for the purposes of assisting Defendants in  
 9 this case. (Dkt. 1266-6.) To date, Otto Trucking has refused to answer any questions about the  
 10 circumstances under which it obtained the earrings or about its communications with Mr.  
 11 Levandowski about the earrings, on grounds of privilege and/or work product protection.

12 Mr. Levandowski has also been cooperating with Uber. For example, calendar invitations  
 13 produced by Uber show that Mr. Levandowski was participating in meetings with Uber executives and  
 14 attorneys – including Salle Yoo, Angela Padilla, Arturo Gonzalez, Karen Dunn, Nicole Bartow, and  
 15 Aaron Bergstrom – to discuss litigation strategy as late as May 3, 2017 – more than a month *after* he  
 16 pled the Fifth Amendment and purportedly refused to cooperate with Uber’s investigation. (*See, e.g.,*  
 17 Ex. 3 [REDACTED]  
 18 [REDACTED]).) Yet while Uber has claimed that Mr. Levandowski has been refusing  
 19 to cooperate with its defense of the litigation, Uber has also maintained that all of its communications  
 20 with Mr. Levandowski are protected from discovery by the common interest and/or attorney-client  
 21 privilege.

## 22 ARGUMENT

23 The Court should preclude Defendants from arguing that Mr. Levandowski has not  
 24 cooperated in their investigation because allowing them to make that argument would sanction  
 25 Uber’s use of the attorney-client, work product, common interest and Fifth Amendment privileges  
 26 as both a sword and a shield. The Court already decided that Defendants cannot selectively waive  
 27 privilege under these circumstances. (Dkt. 1172 (holding that Defendants cannot selectively  
 28 waive privilege with respect to Mr. Levandowski’s reasons for pleading the Fifth Amendment, and

1 noting that “Under Uber’s theory all a party would have to do is cherry pick the communications  
2 they want the opposing party to see and identify those as not privileged, all the while being able to  
3 shield other not so favorable communications from disclosure even if they are about the very same  
4 topic by claiming those communications privileged. The law of privilege is not that unfair.”.)  
5 Other courts similarly preclude parties from using privilege as a sword and shield at the *in limine*  
6 stage. *Columbia Pictures Television, Inc. v. Krypton Broadcasting of Birmingham, Inc.*, 259 F.3d  
7 1186, 1196 (9th Cir. 2001) (affirming district court’s *in limine* ruling prohibiting defendant from  
8 using attorney-client communications as both a sword and a shield); *Gutierrez-Rodriguez v.*  
9 *Cartagena*, 882 F.2d 553, 576 (1st Cir. 1989) (affirming district court’s decision to bar defendant  
10 from testifying at trial due to his previous refusal to testify during discovery on Fifth Amendment  
11 grounds); *Galaxy Comp. Serv’cs, Inc. v. Baker*, 325 B.R. 544, 559 (E.D.Va. 2005) (granting  
12 motion *in limine* to prevent witness from testifying about issues she refused to answer during her  
13 deposition on attorney-client privilege grounds); *Engineered Prods. Co. v. Donaldson Co.,*  
14 *Inc.*, 313 F.Supp. 2d 951, 1022–23 (N.D. Iowa 2004) (barring plaintiff from introducing testimony  
15 at trial on issues it prevented defendant from exploring during deposition by invoking the  
16 attorney-client privilege). Defendants cannot have it both ways, picking and choosing when their  
17 communications with Mr. Levandowski are protected by attorney-client, work product, common  
18 interest and Fifth Amendment privileges, and when those communications can be relied upon in  
19 discovery. This information should be excluded.

20       Allowing Defendants to tell the jury that Mr. Levandowski has not cooperated with their  
21 investigation would also prejudice Waymo. Under FRE 403, evidence should be excluded if its  
22 probative value is substantially outweighed by a danger of “confusing the issues,” “misleading the  
23 jury” or “wasting time,” which is the case here. If admitted, the jury could be left with the  
24 misimpression that Mr. Levandowski *has not* cooperated (which is not true), or Waymo would  
25 have to spend time at trial explaining why this is not true. This explanation would be confusing  
26 and time-consuming; it would force Waymo to explain how Defendants have repeatedly blocked  
27 discovery on privilege grounds, including specifically during the depositions of Mr. Levandowski  
28

1 and Mr. Droz; how Mr. Levandowski himself is the one who coordinated retrieval of the earrings  
2 from Ms. Oz; and how Mr. Levandowski cooperated with Uber to respond to certain Court orders.

3 **CONCLUSION**

4 For the foregoing reasons, Waymo's Motion in Limine No. 14 should be granted.

5  
6 DATED: September 7, 2017

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN,  
LLP

7  
8 By /s/ Charles K. Verhoeven

Charles K. Verhoeven  
9 Attorneys for WAYMO LLC